arXiv:math-ph/0606029v4 15 Sep 2006

Ground State of a Model in Relativistic Quantum Electrodynamics with a Fixed Total Momentum

Itaru Sasaki *
Department of Mathematics,
Hokkaido University,
Sapporo 060-0810, Japan
e-mail: i-sasaki@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp

February 7, 2008

Abstract

A system of a single relativistic electron interacting with the quantized electromagnetic field is considered. We mainly study this system with a fixed total momentum $\mathbf{p}$ — This system is called the Dirac polaron. We analyze the lowest energy $E(\mathbf{p})$ of the Dirac polaron, and derive some properties: concavity, symmetricity, and the inverse energy inequality $E(\mathbf{p}) \leq E(0)$, $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Furthermore, we consider the existence of the ground state of the Dirac polaron. We show that the Dirac polaron has a ground state under a condition which includes an infrared regularization condition and an ultraviolet cutoff. This ensures that the relativistic dressed one electron state exists.

Key words: QED, relativistic QED, finite propagation speed, ground state, Dirac polaron, fibre Hamiltonian.
MSC: 81Q10.

1 Introduction

The energy operator of a system of a single relativistic electron interacting with an external scalar potential V is the Dirac operator $H_D + V$, where $H_D = \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} + M\beta$ is the free Dirac operator. Here we use units such that $\hbar = c = 1$, where $\hbar$ is the Plank's constant and c is the speed of light. The dynamics of each electron state ψ is described by the Dirac equation

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\psi(t) = (H_D + V)\psi(t).$$

However, the description of the electron by this Dirac operator is physically insufficient, because the electron always interacts with the quantum electromagnetic field and the electron cannot be separated from the electromagnetic field.

---

[*] Work partially supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS)

We consider a system of a single electron interacting with the quantized radiation field(= the quantized electromagnetic field with the Coulomb gauge). In the full quantum electrodynamics the electron is described by the Dirac field. But the system we consider in this paper is the *single* electron system with the quantized radiation field, so called the Dirac-Maxwell model. The Hamiltonian of the system is the Dirac operator with the quantized radiation field:

$$H := \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{p}} - q\mathbf{A}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})) + M\beta + H_f + V,$$

where H_f is the Hamiltonian for the free photon, and $-q\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{A}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ is an interaction Hamiltonian, q is a coupling constant ($\mathbf{A}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ is the quantized vector potential). The Hamiltonian H is sometimes called the (quantized) Dirac-Maxwell operator. The dynamics of the Dirac-Maxwell system is described by the following equation:

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Psi(t) = H\Psi(t),$$

where $\Psi(t)$ denotes a state of the electron and photons at time t. Note that H is not bounded from below due to the negative energy part of the Dirac operator. This fact makes analysis of the Dirac-Maxwell model difficult. We impose an ultraviolet cutoff on the quantized vector potential. By this ultraviolet cutoff and the Coulomb gauge, the Dirac-Maxwell system has no relativistic covariance. Nevertheless, the dynamics of the Dirac-Maxwell system has some relativistic property. In particular the electron of the Dirac-Maxwell system has a finite propagation speed and the speed is less than 1 in our units (Proposition 2.2).

In this paper we mainly assume that there is no external potential:

$$V = 0.$$

Then the total momentum of the system conserves, i.e., the Hamiltonian of the system strongly commutes with the total momentum operator $\mathbf{P} := (P_2, P_3, P_3)$. Hence the Hamiltonian has a direct integral decomposition with respect to the total momentum[1, 2]:

$$H \cong \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}^{\oplus} H(\mathbf{p})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p},$$

$$\mathbf{P} \cong \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}^{\oplus} \mathbf{p}\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}.$$

We study the fibre Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{p})$ which describes the dynamics of the relativistic single electron dressed in photons. We call $H(\mathbf{p})$ the Dirac polaron Hamiltonian with total momentum $\mathbf{p}$. A most important fact of the fibre Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{p})$ is that $H(\mathbf{p})$ is bounded from below for all values of all constants: the total momentum $\mathbf{p}$, the electron mass M and the fine-structure constant q (see [14]). Therefore the fibre Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{p})$ has a finite lowest energy $E(\mathbf{p}) := \inf \sigma(H(\mathbf{p})) > -\infty$, where $\sigma(H(\mathbf{p}))$ is the spectrum of $H(\mathbf{p})$. We note that although the lowest energy of H is minus infinity, that of $H(\mathbf{p})$ is finite.

In Section 3, we analyze some properties of the ground state energy $E(\mathbf{p})$, and we prove the inverse energy inequality:

$$E(\mathbf{p}) \leq E(0), \quad \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3. \tag{1}$$

Moreover, under a suitable condition, we show the strict inverse energy inequality:

$$E(\mathbf{p}) < E(0), \quad \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \backslash \{0\}.$$

One of the important quantities of the Dirac polaron is

$$E(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}|, \quad \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

A property of this quantity will be used to establish the existence of a ground state of $H(\mathbf{p})$ in Section 4. We give a condition such that

$$E(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}| > 0, \quad \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \backslash \{0\},$$

for each fixed $\mathbf{p}$. Moreover we give a lower bound function of $E(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}|$. The lower bound is about $(1-b)\min\{|\mathbf{k}|, C\}$, where $1-b$ and C are positive constants.

We refer to the *non-relativistic* QED — the Pauli-Fierz model. The Pauli-Fierz model is a model which describes a dynamics of the non-relativistic electron and the radiation field. There are many researches about the *non-relativistic* model. Many results are written in the book [16]. The Pauli-Fierz Hamiltonians for one electron are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathrm{NR}} &:= \frac{1}{2M}[\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{p}} - q\mathbf{A}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}))]^2 + V, \\ H_{\mathrm{NR,spinless}} &:= \frac{1}{2M}(\hat{\mathbf{p}} - q\mathbf{A}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}))^2 + V, \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ denotes the Pauli matrices. For a suitable potential V and $|q|$ small, H_{NR} is a self-adjoint operator acting on a Hilbert space, and is bounded from below. The one electron Pauli-Fierz Hamiltonian H_{NR} is derived as the non-relativistic limit of the Dirac-Maxwell model([4]). In the case $V = 0$, the total momentum of the Pauli-Fierz models are conserved and the Hamiltonians have a direct integral decomposition (e.g. [13]):

$$H_{\mathrm{NR}} \cong \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}^{\oplus} H_{\mathrm{NR}}(\mathbf{p}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}, \quad H_{\mathrm{NR,spinless}} \cong \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}^{\oplus} H_{\mathrm{NR,spinless}}(\mathbf{p}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}.$$

The lowest energies of these fibre Hamiltonians are automatically finite. We write these lowest energies as $E_{\mathrm{NR}}(\mathbf{p})$, $E_{\mathrm{NR,spinless}}(\mathbf{p})$. For the spinless Pauli-Fierz polaron Hamiltonian $H_{\mathrm{NR,spinless}}(\mathbf{p})$, the following energy inequality holds([16, pp. 206]):

$$E_{\mathrm{NR,spinless}}(0) \leq E_{\mathrm{NR,spinless}}(\mathbf{p}), \quad \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3. \tag{2}$$

This inequality is an inverse relation of (1). T. Chen[7] showed that $H_{\mathrm{NR,spinless}}(0)$ has a ground state for a sufficiently small coupling constant without infrared cutoff, and $H_{\mathrm{NR,spinless}}(\mathbf{p})$ has no ground state for $\mathbf{p} \neq 0$ in a suitable sense. Recently M. Loss, T. Miyao and H. Spohn[13] showed that the fibre Hamiltonian of the many electron Pauli-Fierz Hamiltonian has a ground state under natural conditions which includes the condition $|\mathbf{p}| < 1$ and an energy inequality such as (2). There they do not assume the infrared regularization condition.

The electron of the Pauli-Fierz model is non-relativistic and has *no* finite propagation speed, i.e., the electron of the Pauli-Fierz model can move fast without limit. Since the speed of photon is effectively less than 1, if the electron have a large speed, then the electron may emits the Cherenkov radiation and slow down until the electron velocity becomes less than one. As far as we know, this intuition is not justified completely yet. But this effect has serious influence on the existence of a ground state of $H_{\mathrm{NR}}(\mathbf{p}), H_{\mathrm{NR,spinless}}(\mathbf{p})$, i.e., if the speed of the model is larger than one: $|\mathbf{p}|/M > 1$, then the Hamiltonians $H_{\mathrm{NR}}(\mathbf{p}), H_{\mathrm{NR,spinless}}(\mathbf{p})$ may not have a ground state. See [7].

However, in the Dirac-Maxwell model, the Cherenkov radiation does not occur because the electron speed is always less than one. Hence it is expected that $H(\mathbf{p})$ has a ground state for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ under natural conditions.

In Section 4, we show that $H(\mathbf{p})$ has a ground state for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ under a condition which includes an infrared regularization condition. This result guarantees the existence of the *relativistic* dressed one electron state.

In Section 5, we study the angular momentum and degeneracy of eigenvalues of the Dirac polaron. We will show that the angular momentum of the Dirac polaron conserves and any eigenvalues of $H(\mathbf{p})$ have even multiplicity(admit infinity).

This paper has two appendices. In Appendix A, we show that Dirac-Maxwell model and Dirac polaron are independent of the choice of polarization vectors. Namely, two Hamiltonians which are defined by different polarization vectors are unitarily equivalent each other.

Although all of spectral properties of the Dirac Maxwell Hamiltonian and the Dirac polaron Hamiltonian do not depend on the choice of polarization vectors, the form of angular momentum depend on the polarization vectors, i.e. the form of the angular momentum is defined for each choice of polarization vectors.

In Appendix B, we give a general definition of the angular momentum in quantum electrodynamics.

2 Definitions of the Model

The Hilbert space for the photon field is the Boson Fock space over $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1,2\})$:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}} := \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \left[\bigotimes_{s}^{n} L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1,2\}) \right], \tag{3}$$

where $\otimes_s^n$ means the n-fold symmetric tensor product (see [18]). For a closable operator T on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1,2\})$, we denote by $\mathrm{d}\Gamma(T)$, $\Gamma(T)$ the second quantization operators of T. See [18]. The Hilbert space for the Dirac-Maxwell system is defined by

$$\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}, \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{H} := L^2(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{C}^4)$ is the Hilbert space of the relativistic electron. For each vector $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1,2\})$, we denote by $a(f)$, $a(f)^*$ the annihilation and the creation operator respectively(see [18]). Let $\mathbf{e}^{(\lambda)} : \mathbb{R}^3 \mapsto \mathbb{R}^3, \lambda = 1,2$, be polarization vectors:

$$\mathbf{e}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{e}^{(\mu)}(\mathbf{k}) = \delta_{\lambda,\mu}, \quad \mathbf{e}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{k} = 0, \quad \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3,\ \lambda, \mu \in \{1,2\}.$$

We write as $\mathbf{e}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k}) = (e_1^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k}), e_2^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k}), e_3^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k}))$, and we suppose that each component $e_j^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k})$ is a Borel measurable function of $\mathbf{k}$. For three objects a_1, a_2, a_3, we set $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$ and $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} := \sum_{j=1}^3 a_j b_j$ if $\sum_{j=1}^3 a_j b_j$ is defined. For a linear object $F(\cdot)$ we set $F(\mathbf{a}) := (F(a_1), F(a_2), F(a_3))$. We choose a function

$$\rho \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\omega^{-1}),$$

where "Dom" means the operator domain and ω is multiplication by

$$\omega(\mathbf{k}) = |\mathbf{k}|.$$

The function ρ plays the role of an ultraviolet cutoff. We set

$$g_j(\mathbf{k}, \lambda; \mathbf{x}) := |\mathbf{k}|^{-1/2} \rho(\mathbf{k}) e_j^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k}) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}, \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \lambda = 1, 2, \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

For each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $g_j(\mathbf{x}) := g_j(\cdot\,; \mathbf{x}) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1, 2\})$. For each position $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, we define

$$A_j(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \overline{[a(g_j(\mathbf{x})) + a(g_j(\mathbf{x}))^*]}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3,$$

the quantized vector potential at point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where for a closable operator T, $\bar{T}$ denotes its closure. For each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $A_j(\mathbf{x})$ is a self-adjoint operator on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$(see [18]). The Hilbert space $\mathcal{F}$ can be identified as

$$\mathcal{F} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}^{\oplus} \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x},$$

and we can define a self-adjoint decomposable operator on $\mathcal{F}$ by

$$\mathbf{A}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}^{\oplus} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x},$$

(see [1, 2]). The operator $\mathbf{A}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ is also called the quantized vector potential. The free photon Hamiltonian is defined by

$$H_f := \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\omega).$$

The Dirac-Maxwell Hamiltonian which describes one relativistic free electron interacting with the quantized radiation field is given by

$$H := \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{p}} - q\mathbf{A}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})) + M\beta + H_f,$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = -i\nabla$ and ∇ is the gradient operator in $\mathcal{H}$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \beta$ are 4×4 Dirac matrices, the constant $M \in \mathbb{R}$ is the mass of the electron, $q \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant proportional to the square root of the fine-structure constant. For simplicity, we always omit the tensor product between $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$. It is easy to see that H is symmetric. The essential self-adjointness of H was proven first in the paper[2]. We give a slightly improved result:

Proposition 2.1 (Essential self-adjointness). *$\bar{H}$ is a self-adjoint operator and essentially self-adjoint on any core for $\sqrt{-\triangle} + H_f$.*

Remark. The Hamiltonian $\bar{H}$ seems to depend on the choice of the polarization vectors $\mathbf{e}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$, $\mathbf{e}^{(2)}(\mathbf{k})$. However, we can show that $\bar{H}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\bar{H}'$ defined by using another polarization vectors $\mathbf{e}'^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$, $\mathbf{e}'^{(2)}(\mathbf{k})$, see Appendix A. Therefore, all physical consequences of the model do not depend on the choice of polarization vectors.

Proof. The proof is a simple application of the Nelson's commutator theorem. Our choice of a comparison operator for the Nelson's commutator theorem is $\sqrt{-\triangle}+H_f$. See [15] for detailed estimates. $\square$

The Hilbert space $\mathcal{F}$ can be identified as $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3;\mathbb{C}^4\otimes\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}})$ naturally. For each state $\Psi\in\mathcal{F}$, the support of electron part is defined by

$$\text{el-supp}(\Psi) := \mathrm{supp}(\|\Psi(\cdot)\|_{\mathbb{C}^4\otimes\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}}).$$

Let S be a region in $\mathbb{R}^3$. For each $t\geq 0$, we set

$$LC(S,t) := \{\mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{R}^3 | |\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|\leq t, \mathbf{x}\in S\}.$$

Let $V\in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be a real-valued function. The electron of the Dirac-Maxwell model have a finite propagation speed:

Proposition 2.2 (Finite propagation speed of electron). *Assume that $H+V$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{p}}+M\beta+V$ are essentially self-adjoint. For any state $\Psi\in\mathcal{F}$, the time evolution $\Psi(t) := \exp(-it(\overline{H+V}))\Psi$ satisfies that*

$$\text{el-supp}(\Psi(t)) \subseteq LC(\text{el-supp}(\Psi),t), \quad t\geq 0.$$

Proof. By the Trotter product formula, we have

$$\Psi(t) := \operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty}\left[\exp\Big(-\frac{it}{n}\overline{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{p}}+M\beta+V)}\Big)\exp\Big(-\frac{it}{n}(H_f-q\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{A}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}))\Big)\right]^n\Psi$$

It is easy to see that $\exp[-(it/n)(H_f-q\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{A}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}))]$ does not change the electron support. It is well known that the Dirac operator $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{p}}+M\beta+V$ has a finite propagation speed and the speed is less than one. Hence for any state $\Phi\in\mathcal{F}$,

$$\text{el-supp}(\exp(-it\overline{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{p}}+M\beta+V)}/n)) \subseteq LC(\Phi,t/n).$$

Thus we have that

$$\text{el-supp}\left(\Big[\exp\Big(-\frac{it}{n}\overline{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{p}}+M\beta+V)}\Big)\exp\Big(-\frac{it}{n}(H_f-q\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{A}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}))\Big)\Big]^n\Psi\right)\subseteq LC(\Psi,t).$$

Note that the strong limit does not change the electron support. Thus the proposition follows. $\square$

We define the momentum operator $\mathbf{P}^{\mathrm{rad}}$ of the quantized radiation field by

$$\mathbf{P}^{\mathrm{rad}} = \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\hat{\mathbf{k}}).$$

Each component P_j^{rad} ($j = 1, 2, 3$) is a self-adjoint operator on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$. The total momentum operator is defined by

$$\mathbf{P} := \overline{\hat{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{P}^{\mathrm{rad}}}.$$

The total momentum of the system governed by the Hamiltonian H is conserved, i.e., the Hamiltonian H strongly commutes with $\mathbf{P}$ (see [2]). To find the polaron Hamiltonian, we define a self-adjoint operator

$$Q := \overline{\hat{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{P}^{\mathrm{rad}}},$$

where $\hat{x} = (\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_3)$ are the multiplication operators of the functions x_1, x_2, x_3 acting on $\mathcal{H}$. Let U_F be the Fourier transform on $\mathcal{H}$, and we set $U := U_F \exp(iQ)$. By this unitary operator U, the Hamiltonian $\bar{H}$ and total momentum operator $\mathbf{P}$ are transformed as follows(see[1]):

$$\begin{aligned} U\bar{H}U^* &= \overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot [\widetilde{\mathbf{p}} - \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\hat{\mathbf{k}}) - q\mathbf{A}] + M\beta + H_f}, \\ U\mathbf{P}U^* &= \widetilde{\mathbf{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{A} := \mathbf{A}(0)$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}$ is the multiplication operator by the (Fourier transformed) coordinates (p_1, p_2, p_3) on the Fourier transformed Hilbert space $U_F\mathcal{H}$. We can identify $U\mathcal{F}$ as

$$U\mathcal{F} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}^{\oplus} \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}. \tag{5}$$

The fibre Hamiltonian we consider is of the form

$$H(\mathbf{p}) := \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + M\beta + H_f - \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\hat{\mathbf{k}}) - q\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{A}, \tag{6}$$

which acts on each fibre $\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$ and $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is a constant. The polaron Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{p})$ is the fibre of $U\bar{H}U^*$ in the decomposition (5)(see [1, 2]):

Proposition 2.3. *For all* $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $H(\mathbf{p})$ *is essentially self-adjoint and*

$$\begin{aligned} U\bar{H}U^* &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}^{\oplus} \overline{H(\mathbf{p})} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}, \\ U\mathbf{P}U^* &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}^{\oplus} \mathbf{p} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark. Physically $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$ is the Hamiltonian of the fixed total momentum $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. We can show that all the spectral properties of $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$ do not depend on the choice of polarization vectors, because the Hamiltonians with different polarization vectors are unitarily equivalent each other. See Appendix A.

Remark. We call $H(\mathbf{p})$ the Dirac polaron Hamiltonian.

Remark. The polaron model of the non-relativistic quantum electrodynamics is derived by the non-relativistic limit of $H(\mathbf{p})$. See [5].

One of the most important fact of $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$ is the boundedness from below:

Theorem 2.4. *The Dirac polaron Hamiltonian* $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$ *is bounded below.*

Proof. See [14]. Although we needed the condition $\rho \in \mathrm{Dom}(\omega^{1/2})$ in the proof of [14], one can remove this condition by a careful estimate. $\square$

Thus we can define the lowest energy of the Dirac polaron with total momentum $\mathbf{p}$:

$$E(\mathbf{p}) := \inf \sigma(\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}),$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ means the spectrum.

For a constant $m \geq 0$, we define a regularized Hamiltonian of $H(\mathbf{p})$:

$$H_m(\mathbf{p}) := \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + M\beta + H_f(m) - \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\mathbf{k}) - q\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{A}, \tag{7}$$

where

$$H_f(m) := \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\omega_m), \quad \omega_m(\mathbf{k}) = (1+m)|\mathbf{k}| + m. \tag{8}$$

The case $m = 0$ is the original case $H_0(\mathbf{p}) = H(\mathbf{p})$. By the Kato-Rellich theorem, one can easily show that for all $m > 0$ the massive Hamiltonian $H_m(\mathbf{p})$ is self-adjoint on $\mathrm{Dom}(H_f(m))$, and essentially self-adjoint on any core for $H_f(m)$. Since $H_m(\mathbf{p}) \geq H(\mathbf{p})$, $H_m(\mathbf{p})$ is also bounded from below.

We set

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}) := \inf \sigma(\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}). \tag{9}$$

For a bounded below self-adjoint operator T, we say that T has a ground state if $\inf \sigma(T)$ is an eigenvalue of T.

For $m > 0$, the massive Hamiltonian $H_m(\mathbf{p})$ was studied in [1, 2], in which A. Arai showed that $H_m(\mathbf{p})$ has a ground state for all $m > 0$.

Proposition 2.5 (Existence of ground state in the massive case). *Assume that* $m > 0$. *Then, the distance between* $E_m(\mathbf{p})$ *and the essential spectrum of* $H_m(\mathbf{p})$ *equals* $m > 0$. *In particular,* $H_m(\mathbf{p})$ *has a ground state.*

Proof. See [1]. $\square$

Remark. Since the condition in Proposition 2.5 has no restriction in $\mathbf{p}$, $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ admits a ground state for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. This fact is one of the crucial differences between the Dirac-Maxwell model and the non-relativistic model such as the Pauli-Fierz model.

3 Some Properties of the Ground State Energy $E_m(\mathbf{p})$

The ground state energy $E_m(\mathbf{p})$ may depend on all the constants in $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$: the total momentum $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, the electron mass $M \in \mathbb{R}$, the virtual photon mass $m \geq 0$, the ultraviolet cutoff function ρ, and the coupling constant $q \in \mathbb{R}$. But $E_m(\mathbf{p})$ does not depend on the choice of polarization vectors. When the dependence of these variables is important, we write $E_m(\mathbf{p})$ as $E_m(\mathbf{p}, M, \cdots)$, making it explicitly.

The following results hold including the massless case $m = 0$, unless otherwise specified.

Proposition 3.1 (Concavity of the ground state energy). *$E_m(\mathbf{p})$ is a concave function in the variables $(\mathbf{p}, M, q) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$.*

Proposition 3.2 (Continuity of the ground state energy). *$E_m(\mathbf{p}, M)$ is a Lipschitz continuous function of $(\mathbf{p}, M)$, i.e.,*

$$|E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) - E_m(\mathbf{p}', M')| \leq \sqrt{|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}'|^2 + |M - M'|^2}, \quad \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{R}^3,\ M, M' \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proposition 3.3 (Reflection symmetry in the electron mass M). *The Hamiltonian $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}, M)}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}, -M)}$. In particular*

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) = E_m(\mathbf{p}, -M), \quad E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) \leq E_m(\mathbf{p}, 0).$$

A symmetry of a cutoff function ρ leads to a symmetry of the same kind with respect to the total momentum $\mathbf{p}$ of $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$:

Proposition 3.4 (Symmetry in the total momentum). *Assume that $|\rho(\mathbf{k})| = |\rho(T\mathbf{k})|$* a.e. $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ *for an orthogonal matrix $T \in O(3)$. Then $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\overline{H_m(T\mathbf{p})}$, and $E_m(\mathbf{p}) = E_m(T\mathbf{p})$.*

If the cutoff function $|\rho(\mathbf{k})|$ has the reflection symmetry at the origin, the following important inequality holds.

Theorem 3.5 (Inverse energy inequality). *Assume that $|\rho(\mathbf{k})| = |\rho(-\mathbf{k})|$,* a.e. $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. *Then, the inverse energy inequality*

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}) \leq E_m(0), \quad \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$$

holds.

Assuming that $H_m(0)$ has a ground state, we can obtain the following strict inverse energy inequality:

Theorem 3.6 (Strict inverse energy inequality). *Assume that $|\rho(\mathbf{k})| = |\rho(-\mathbf{k})|$* a.e. $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. *If $\overline{H_m(0)}$ has a ground state, then*

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}) < E_m(0), \quad \textit{for all } \mathbf{p} \neq 0.$$

Remark. When $m > 0$, the massive Hamiltonian $H_m(0)$ has a ground state (Proposition 2.5). In the massless case $m = 0$, $H(0)$ has a ground state under suitable conditions(see the conditions in the following Theorems 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3.)

A function $f(\mathbf{k})$ is called rotation invariant function if $f(\mathbf{k}) = f(T\mathbf{k})$ for all $T \in SO(3)$.

If the cutoff function ρ is rotation invariant, the spectral properties of $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ does not depend on the direction of $\mathbf{p}$:

Proposition 3.7 (Spherical symmetry in the total momentum). *Assume that $|\rho(\mathbf{k})|$ is a rotation invariant function. Then $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}')}$ for all $\mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $|\mathbf{p}| = |\mathbf{p}'|$. In particular $E_m(\mathbf{p})$ is rotation invariant with respect to $\mathbf{p}$, and $E_m(\mathbf{p}) \geq E_m(\mathbf{p}')$ if $|\mathbf{p}| \leq |\mathbf{p}'|$.*

Proposition 3.8 (Massless limit of the ground state energy). *$E_m(\mathbf{p})$ is monotone non-decreasing in $m \geq 0$ and*

$$\lim_{m \to +0} E_m(\mathbf{p}) = E_0(\mathbf{p}).$$

Generally, by Proposition 3.2, the following inequality holds:

$$0 \leq E_m(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}|, \quad \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

The function $\mathbf{k} \to E_m(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}|$ plays the role of a dispersion relation in the low-energy Dirac polaron. The next Theorem is an important fact.

Theorem 3.9 (Lower bound on the energy-momentum-dispersion relation). *Assume that ρ is rotation invariant. Suppose that $E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) < E_m(\mathbf{p}, 0)$. Then, if $\mathbf{p} \neq 0$, the following estimate holds:*

$$E_m(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k}, M) - E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) + |\mathbf{k}| \geq \begin{cases} |\mathbf{k}| & \textit{if} \quad |\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k}| \leq |\mathbf{p}|, \\ (1 - b_m(\mathbf{p}))|\mathbf{k}| & \textit{if} \quad |\mathbf{p}| \leq |\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k}| \leq 2|\mathbf{p}|, \\ (1 - b_m(\mathbf{p}))|\mathbf{p}| & \textit{if} \quad 2|\mathbf{p}| \leq |\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k}|, \end{cases}$$

where

$$b_m(\mathbf{p}) := \frac{E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) - E_m(2\mathbf{p}, M)}{|\mathbf{p}|} < 1.$$

In the case $\mathbf{p} = 0$, for all constant $P > 0$ the following estimate holds:

$$E_m(\mathbf{k}, M) - E_m(0, M) + |\mathbf{k}| \geq \begin{cases} \frac{a_m(P)}{P}|\mathbf{k}|, & \textit{if} \quad |\mathbf{k}| \leq P \\ a_m(P), & \textit{if} \quad |\mathbf{k}| > P, \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

where

$$a_m(P) := (E_m(\mathbf{k}, M) - E_m(0, M) + |\mathbf{k}|)\Big|_{|\mathbf{k}| = P}$$

is a strictly positive constant.

Remark. These inequalities are important to establish the existence of a ground state of $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$. As for these aspects, we were motivated by [13].

4 Existence of a Ground State

In paper[1] A. Arai studied a Hamiltonian in a class which includes the massive Hamiltonian $H_m(\mathbf{p})$, $m > 0$ and prove the existence of a ground state of $H_m(\mathbf{p})$, $m > 0$. The class of Hamiltonians and conditions considered in [1] do not include the massless Dirac polaron $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$.

In this section, we give criterions for $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$ to have a ground state and prove the existence of the relativistic dressed single electron state. The criterions are essentially same as the infrared regularization condition.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that* $E(\mathbf{p}, M) < E(\mathbf{p}, 0)$*. Suppose that* ρ *is rotation invariant. If*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{q^2}{(E(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}|)^2} \frac{|\rho(\mathbf{k})|^2}{|\mathbf{k}|} d\mathbf{k} < 1, \tag{11}$$

then the Dirac polaron Hamiltonian $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$ *has a ground state.*

Using the lower bound on the energy-momentum-dispersion relation(Theorem 3.9), we obtain the following theorem:

Theorem 4.2. *Let* ρ *be rotation invariant. Suppose that* $E(\mathbf{p}, M) < E(\mathbf{p}, 0)$*. Assume the infrared regular condition* $\rho \in \mathrm{Dom}(\omega^{-3/2})$*. Then there exists a constant* $q_0 > 0$ *such that for all* q *with* $|q| < q_0$*,* $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$ *has a ground state.*

Proof of Theorem 4.1 is based on the photon number bound. Therefore the inequality (11) is a restriction on the coupling constant q. If one uses the photon derivative bound in the proof of the existence of ground state, one can remove this restriction on the coupling constant q.

We need the following assumption:

(Λ) (i) ρ is a rotation invariant function. (ii) There is an open set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\bar{S} = \mathrm{supp}\, \rho$ and ρ is continuously differentiable in S. (iii) For all $R > 0$, the bounded region $S_R := \{\mathbf{k} \in S | |\mathbf{k}| < R\}$ has the cone property.

The theorem below guarantees the existence of *relativistic* dressed one electron state without restriction on the coupling constant q:

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that* $E(\mathbf{p}, M) < E(\mathbf{p}, 0)$*. Assume* ($\Lambda$)*. Moreover we assume that*

$$\rho \in \mathrm{Dom}(\omega^{-3/2}), \quad |\mathbf{k}|^{-5/2}\rho(\mathbf{k}) \in L^p(S_R), \quad |\mathbf{k}|^{-3/2}|\nabla\rho(\mathbf{k})| \in L^p(S_R), \tag{12}$$

for all $p \in [1, 2)$ *and* $R > 0$*. Then* $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$ *has a ground state.*

Remark. Let $\chi_{\kappa,\Lambda}(\mathbf{k})$ be a characteristic function of the region $\{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3 | \kappa < |\mathbf{k}| < \Lambda\}$. For all $\kappa > 0$ and $\Lambda < \infty$, the cutoff function $\rho = \chi_{\kappa,\Lambda}$ satisfies the conditions (Λ) and (12) in Theorem 4.3. The function $\rho(\mathbf{k}) = |\mathbf{k}| \exp(-\lambda|\mathbf{k}|)$ ($\lambda > 0$) also satisfies the conditions (Λ) and (12).

5 Angular Momentum and Degeneracy of Eigenvalues

Let $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ be a unit vector. In this section we show that the angular momentum around $\mathbf{j}$-axis in the Dirac-polaron system is conserved if $\mathbf{p}$ is parallel to $\mathbf{j}$ and $\rho(\mathbf{k})$ has a rotation invariant property around the $\mathbf{j}$-axis.

Let $(\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}, \mathbf{e})$ be a Dirac polaron system in which we adopt $\mathbf{e} = (\mathbf{e}^{(1)}, \mathbf{e}^{(2)})$ as the choice of the polarization vectors. The total angular momentum around $\mathbf{j}$-axis in the system $(\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}, \mathbf{e})$ is defined by

$$J_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e}) := S_{\mathbf{j}} + L_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e}),$$

where $S_{\mathbf{j}} := \oplus^2 (\mathbf{j} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})/2$ and $L_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e})$ is a general angular momentum for the radiation field which is defined in Appendix B.

The following proposition is a fundamental fact and one can easily prove this:

Proposition 5.1. *The spectrum of* $J_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e})$ *is the set of half-integers:*

$$\sigma(J_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e})) = \mathbb{Z}_{1/2} := \{\pm 1/2, \pm 3/2, \pm 5/2, \cdots\}.$$

In particular $J_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e})$ *is decomposable as*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}} &\cong \bigoplus_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_{1/2}} \mathcal{F}(z), \\ J_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e}) &\cong \bigoplus_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_{1/2}} z. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The conclusion in this section is the next theorem:

Theorem 5.2. *Let* $\mathbf{j}$ *is a unit vector which parallel with* $\mathbf{p}$. *Assume that* $\rho(\mathbf{k}) = \rho(R\mathbf{k}), \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ *for all* $R \in O(3)$ *with* $R\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j}$. *Then* $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ *strongly commutes with* $J_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e})$. *In particular,* $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ *is decomposable as*

$$\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})} \cong \bigoplus_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_{1/2}} H_m(\mathbf{p} : z),$$

in the same sense of (13). Moreover, for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}_{1/2}$, $H_m(\mathbf{p} : z)$ *is unitarily equivalent to* $H_m(\mathbf{p} : -z)$, *and all the eigenvalues of* $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ *has an even degrees of degeneracy.*

Remark. Theorem 5.2 means that if a ground state of $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ exists, then the ground state is degenerate with an even degree.

Remark. By a similar way that is used in [10, 11], we can show that for sufficiently small q the degrees of degeneracy of the ground state $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ is less than 5.

6 Proofs of Proposition 3.1-3.4, 3.7, 3.8 and Theorem 3.5, 3.6, 3.9

We note that the operator $H_m(\mathbf{p})$ is essentially self-adjoint on any core for $H_f(m)$, because the term $-\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\hat{\mathbf{k}}) - q\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{A}$ is H_f-bounded with relative bound 1(see [14]) and one can apply Wüst's theorem (see [18]). We set $\mathcal{D} := \mathrm{Dom}(H_f) \cap \mathrm{Dom}(N_{\mathrm{b}})$. $\mathcal{D}$ is a common core for $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$, $(m \geq 0)$. When we want to write the explicit dependence of variables $(\mathbf{p}, M, m, q)$, we write $H_m(\mathbf{p})$ as $H_m(\mathbf{p}, M, q)$.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let $(\mathbf{p}, M, q), (\mathbf{p}', M', q') \in \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{R}$, and $t \in [0, 1]$. Then for all $\Psi \in \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \Psi, H_m(t\mathbf{p} + (1-t)\mathbf{p}', tM + (1-t)M', tq + (1-t)q')\Psi \rangle \\ &= t\langle \Psi, H_m(\mathbf{p}, M, q)\Psi \rangle + (1-t)\langle \Psi, H_m(\mathbf{p}', M', q')\Psi \rangle \\ &\geq tE_m(\mathbf{p}, M, q) + (1-t)E_m(\mathbf{p}', M', q'). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$E_m(t\mathbf{p} + (1-t)\mathbf{p}', tM + (1-t)M', tq + (1-t)q') \geq tE_m(\mathbf{p}, M, q) + (1-t)E_m(\mathbf{p}', M', q'),$$

which implies that $E_m(\mathbf{p}, M, q)$ is a concave function. □

Proof of Proposition 3.2. By the equality $H_m(\mathbf{p}, M) = H_m(\mathbf{p}', M') + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}') + (M - M')\beta$, and the variational principle, we have $E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) \leq H_m(\mathbf{p}', M') + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}') + (M - M')\beta$, in the sense of a quadratic form on $\mathcal{D}$. Hence we have

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) \leq E_m(\mathbf{p}', M') + \sqrt{|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}'|^2 + (M - M')^2}.$$

Similarly, we have $E_m(\mathbf{p}', M') \leq E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) + \sqrt{|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}'|^2 + (M - M')^2}$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.3. We set $\gamma_5 := -i\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3$. It is easy to see that $-\gamma_5$ is a unitary operator and $\gamma_5 \overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}, M)} \gamma_5^* = \overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}, -M)}$. Therefore $E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) = E_m(\mathbf{p}, -M)$. By Proposition 3.1, $M \mapsto E_m(\mathbf{p}, M)$ is concave. Hence $E_m(\mathbf{p}, 0) = E_m(\mathbf{p}, \frac{1}{2}M - \frac{1}{2}M) \geq E_m(\mathbf{p}, M)$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.4. For the matrix $T \in O(3)$, we define four 4×4 matrices:

$$\beta' := \beta, \quad \alpha_j' := \sum_{j=1}^{3} T_{j,l}\alpha_l, \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

It is easy to see that $\{\alpha_j', \beta'\} = 0$, $\{\alpha_j', \alpha_l'\} = 2\delta_{j,l}$, $j, l = 1, 2, 3$. Then there exists a 4×4 unitary matrix u_T such that (see [19, Lemma 2.25])

$$u_T \alpha_j u_T^{-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{3} T_{j,k}\alpha_k, \quad u_T \beta u_T^{-1} = \beta.$$

Therefore $u_T \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} u_T^{-1} = \sum_{k,l=1}^{3} T_{l,k}\alpha_k p_l = \sum_{k,l=1}^{3} \alpha_k (T^{-1})_{k,l} p_l = \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot (T^{-1}\mathbf{p})$. Similarly, we have

$$u_T(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot d\Gamma(\hat{\mathbf{k}}))u_T^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot (T^{-1} \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\hat{\mathbf{k}})), \quad u_T \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{A} u_T^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot (T^{-1}\mathbf{A}) = (T\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \cdot \mathbf{A}.$$

We define 1-photon rotation operator $\hat{T}$ by

$$(\hat{T}f)(\mathbf{k}, \lambda) = f(T^{-1}\mathbf{k}, \lambda), \quad (\mathbf{k}, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1, 2\}, \quad f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1, 2\}).$$

Then for all $f \in \mathrm{Dom}(\hat{k}_j \hat{T})$

$$\hat{T}^{-1}\hat{k}_j\hat{T}f(\mathbf{k}, \lambda) = (k_j\hat{T}f)(T\mathbf{k}, \lambda) = (T\mathbf{k})_j(\hat{T}f)(T\mathbf{k}, \lambda) = (T\mathbf{k})_j f(\mathbf{k}, \lambda).$$

Hence we obtain an operator equality $\hat{T}^{-1}\hat{k}_j\hat{T} = (T\hat{\mathbf{k}})_j$, $(j = 1, 2, 3)$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Gamma(\hat{T}^{-1})\mathrm{d}\Gamma(\hat{k}_j)\Gamma(\hat{T}) = \mathrm{d}\Gamma((T\hat{\mathbf{k}})_j) = (T \cdot \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\hat{\mathbf{k}}))_j, \\
&\Gamma(\hat{T}^{-1})H_f(m)\Gamma(\hat{T}) = H_f(m) \\
&\Gamma(\hat{T}^{-1})A_j\Gamma(\hat{T}), = \Phi_S(\hat{T}^{-1}g_j), \quad j = 1, 2, 3,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi_S(\cdot)$ is the Segal field operator(see[18]) and $g_j(\cdot) := g_j(\cdot, \mathbf{x} = 0) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1, 2\})$. The operator $U := u_T \otimes \Gamma(\hat{T}^{-1})$ is a unitary operator on $\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$ and

$$U\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}U^{-1} = \overline{(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot (T^{-1}\mathbf{p}) + M\beta + H_f(m) - \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\hat{\mathbf{k}}) - q(T\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \cdot \Phi_S(\hat{T}^{-1}\mathbf{g}))}. \tag{14}$$

Note that T is a 3×3-matrix and $\hat{T}$ is a unitary operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1,2\})$. Since $T \in O(3)$, we have $(T\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \cdot \Phi_S(\hat{T}^{-1}\mathbf{g}) = \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot T^{-1}\Phi_S(\hat{T}^{-1}\mathbf{g})$, i.e.,

$$(T^{-1}\Phi_S(\hat{T}^{-1}\mathbf{g}))_j = \sum_{l=1}^{3}(T^{-1})_{j,l}\Phi_S(\hat{T}^{-1}g_l), \quad j = 1,2,3. \tag{15}$$

We define functions

$$\mathbf{e}'^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k}) = T^{-1}\mathbf{e}^{(\lambda)}(T\mathbf{k}), \quad (\mathbf{k},\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1,2\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathbf{e}'^{(1)}, \mathbf{e}'^{(2)}$ are polarization vectors: $\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{e}'^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k}) = 0$, $\mathbf{e}'^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k})\cdot\mathbf{e}'^{(\mu)}(\mathbf{k}) = \delta_{\lambda,\mu}$. Since $|\rho(\mathbf{k})| = |\rho(T\mathbf{k})|$, there exists a Borel measurable function $\mathbf{k} \mapsto \kappa(\mathbf{k}) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\rho(T\mathbf{k}) = e^{i\kappa(\mathbf{k})}\rho(\mathbf{k})$, a.e. $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^{3}(T^{-1})_{j,l}g_l(T\mathbf{k},\lambda) = \frac{e^{i\kappa(\mathbf{k})}\rho(\mathbf{k})}{|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}}e_j'^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k}). \tag{16}$$

Let $H_m'(\mathbf{p})$ be $H_m(\mathbf{p})$ with $\mathbf{e}^{(\lambda)}$ replaced by $\mathbf{e}'^{(\lambda)}$. By (14),(15) and (16), we have

$$U\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}U^* = V\overline{H_m'(T^{-1}\mathbf{p})}V^*,$$

where $V := \Gamma(e^{i\kappa(\cdot)})$. By Theorem 9.2, $\overline{H_m'(T^{-1}\mathbf{p})}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\overline{H_m(T^{-1}\mathbf{p})}$. Therefore, $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\overline{H_m(T^{-1}\mathbf{p})}$. Since $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is arbitrary in the above argument, $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\overline{H_m(T\mathbf{p})}$, and $E_m(\mathbf{p}) = E_m(T\mathbf{p})$. ☐

Proof of Theorem 3.5. By the assumption $\rho(\mathbf{k}) = \rho(-\mathbf{k})$ a.e. $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and Proposition 3.4, we have $E_m(\mathbf{p}) = E_m(-\mathbf{p})$, $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Using the concavity in Proposition 3.1, we obtain

$$E_m(0) = E_m(\tfrac{1}{2}\mathbf{p} - \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbf{p}) \geq \frac{1}{2}E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \frac{1}{2}E_m(-\mathbf{p}) = E_m(\mathbf{p}),$$

for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. ☐

Proof of Theorem 3.6. We assume the equality $E_m(\mathbf{p}) = E_m(0)$ for a nonzero vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$. Let $\Phi_m(0)$ be a normalized ground state of $H_m(0)$. For $t = 1, -1$, we have

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}) = E_m(t\mathbf{p}) \leq \langle \Phi_m(0), H_m(t\mathbf{p})\Phi_m(0)\rangle = t\langle \Phi_m(0), \boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{p}\Phi_m(0)\rangle + E_m(0).$$

Therefore $\langle \Phi_m(0), \boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{p}\Phi_m(0)\rangle = 0$, and hence $\langle \Phi_m(0), H_m(\mathbf{p})\Phi_m(0)\rangle = E_m(0) = E_m(\mathbf{p})$, which implies that $\Phi_m(0)$ is a ground state of $H_m(\mathbf{p})$: $E_m(\mathbf{p})\Phi_m(0) = H_m(\mathbf{p})\Phi_m(0)$. Thus $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{p}\Phi_m(0) = 0$, and we get a contradiction $|\mathbf{p}|^2\Phi_m(0) = 0$. ☐

Proof of Proposition 3.7. The first half of Proposition 3.7 is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.4. We show that $E_m(\mathbf{p})$ is non-increasing in $|\mathbf{p}|$. Temporarily we assume that there exist vectors $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $|\mathbf{p}| \leq |\mathbf{p}'|$ and $E_m(\mathbf{p}) < E_m(\mathbf{p}')$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\mathbf{p}' = t\mathbf{p}$ for some $t \geq 1$, because $E_m(\mathbf{p})$ does not depend on $\mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}|$. Since $E_m(s\mathbf{p}) \to E_m(0), (s \to 0)$, and the map $\mathbb{R} : s \mapsto E_m(s\mathbf{p})$ is continuous, there exists a constant

$s' \in [0,1)$ such that $E_m(s'\mathbf{p}) = E_m(\mathbf{p}')$. We set $r := (t-1)/(t-s') \in [0,1)$. Then we get a contradiction

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}) = E_m(r(s'\mathbf{p}) + (1-r)\mathbf{p}') \geq rE_m(s'\mathbf{p}) + (1-r)E_m(\mathbf{p}') = E_m(\mathbf{p}').$$

Therefore $E_m(\mathbf{p})$ is a non-increasing function of $|\mathbf{p}|$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.8. Let $m \geq m' \geq 0$. Then we have $H_m(\mathbf{p}) \geq H_{m'}(\mathbf{p})$ in the sense of quadratic form on $\mathcal{D}$. Therefore $m \mapsto E_m(\mathbf{p})$ is monotone non-decreasing: $E_m(\mathbf{p}) \geq E_{m'}(\mathbf{p})$. It is easy to see that for all $\Psi \in \mathcal{D}$, $H_m(\mathbf{p})\Psi \to H(\mathbf{p})\Psi$ as $m \to 0$. Since $\mathcal{D}$ is a common core for all $H_m(\mathbf{p})$, $H_m(\mathbf{p}) \to H(\mathbf{p})$ in the strong resolvent sense (see [17, Theorem VIII. 25]). Using a fact about a strongly convergent operators[17, Theorem VIII. 24], we obtain that $E_m(\mathbf{p}) \to E(\mathbf{p})$ as $m \to +0$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.9. We need the next lemma:

Lemma 6.1. *Assume that* $E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) < E_m(\mathbf{p}, 0)$. *Then*

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M) - E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) + |\mathbf{k}| > 0, \quad \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3\backslash\{0\}.$$

Proof. We prove this lemma by absurd. First we prove it in the massive case $m > 0$. We fix $M \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Assume that

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}| = 0, \tag{17}$$

for a vector $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3\backslash\{0\}$. Let $\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})$ be a normalized ground state of $H_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})$(see Proposition 2.5). Then

$$\begin{aligned} E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) &= \langle \Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}), \overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})}\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})\rangle \\ &= \langle \Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}), \overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})\rangle - \langle \Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}), \boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{k}\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})\rangle \\ &\geq E_m(\mathbf{p}) - |\mathbf{k}|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by assumption (17) we have $\langle \Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}), \overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})\rangle = E_m(\mathbf{p})$ and $\langle \Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}), \boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{k}\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})\rangle = |\mathbf{k}|$, which implies that $\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})$ is a ground state of both $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ and $-\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{k}$. Since $\mathbf{k}$ is a non-zero vector, we have $\langle \Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}), \beta\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})\rangle = 0$, because $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{k}\beta = -\beta\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{k}$. In what follows, to emphasize M-dependence, we write $H_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})$ and $\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})$ as $H_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M)$ and $\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M)$ respectively. Using the above facts, we have

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) = \langle \Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M), \overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}, 0)}\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M)\rangle \geq E_m(\mathbf{p}, 0),$$

which contradicts $E_m(\mathbf{p}, M) < E_m(\mathbf{p}, 0)$. Next, we prove the case $m = 0$. Assume that there exist a vector $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3\backslash\{0\}$ such that the equality $E(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M) - E(\mathbf{p}, M) + |\mathbf{k}| = 0$ holds. It is easy to see that $\lim_{m\to+0}\langle \Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M), \overline{H(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M)}\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M)\rangle = E(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M)$. By these equations, we have

$$\lim_{m\to+0}\langle \Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M), \boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{k}\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M)\rangle = |\mathbf{k}|, \tag{18}$$

$$\lim_{m\to+0}\langle \Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M), \overline{H(\mathbf{p}, M)}\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}, M)\rangle = E(\mathbf{p}, M). \tag{19}$$

Equation (18) implies that

$$\lim_{m\to+0}(|\mathbf{k}|-\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k},M)=0.$$

Therefore $\lim_{m\to+0}\langle\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k},M),\beta\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k},M)\rangle=0$. This fact and equation (19) mean that $E(\mathbf{p},M)=E(\mathbf{p},0)$, which is a contradiction with $E(\mathbf{p},M)<E(\mathbf{p},0)$. □

We fix the vector $\mathbf{p}$ such that $E_m(\mathbf{p},M)<E_m(\mathbf{p},0)$. Since ρ is rotation invariant, by Proposition 3.7, the function

$$G_m(|\mathbf{k}|):=E_m(0)-E_m(\mathbf{k}),\quad \mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{R}^3.$$

is monotone non-decreasing, convex with respect to $|\mathbf{k}|$, and the following inequality holds

$$0\le G_m(|\mathbf{k}|)\le|\mathbf{k}|,\quad \mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{R}^3. \tag{20}$$

Since $G_m(s)$ is convex, $G_m(s)$ has a right derivative ${G_m^+}'(s)$:

$${G_m^+}'(s):=\lim_{h\to+0}[G_m(s+h)-G_m(s)]/h.$$

First we show that

$${G_m^+}'(s)<1,\quad 0\le s\le|\mathbf{p}|. \tag{21}$$

Since $G_m(s)$ is convex and $0\le G_m(s)\le s$, ${G_m^+}'(s)$ is a monotone non-decreasing function of s. If ${G_m^+}'(s_0)>1$ for a constant $s_0\ge0$, then ${G_m^+}'(s)>1$ for all $s\ge s_0$ and

$$G_m(s)=\int_{s_0}^{s}{G_m^+}'(t)\mathrm{d}t+\int_0^{s_0}{G_m^+}'(t)\mathrm{d}t\ge(s-s_0){G_m^+}'(s_0)+\int_0^{s_0}{G_m^+}'(t)\mathrm{d}t,\quad (s>s_0).$$

It contradicts (20). Thus, ${G_m^+}'(s)\le1$ for all $s\ge0$. Let $s_1\ge0$ be a point such that ${G_m^+}'(s_1)=1$ and ${G_m^+}'(s_1-\epsilon)<1$ for all $0<\epsilon\le s_1$. If $|\mathbf{p}|<s_1$, (21) is trivial. Thus we consider the case $|\mathbf{p}|\ge s_1$. Note that ${G_m^+}'(s)=1$ for all $s\ge s_1$. Hence $G_m(s)$ is linear if $s\ge s_1$:

$$G_m(s)=s+\text{neg.const.},\quad s\ge s_1,$$

where "neg.const." denotes a negative constant. By this equality, we have that

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})-E_m(\mathbf{p})+|\mathbf{k}|=-|\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}|+|\mathbf{p}|+|\mathbf{k}|,$$

for all $\mathbf{p},\mathbf{k}$ with $|\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}|\ge s_1$, $|\mathbf{p}|\ge s_1$. We choose $\mathbf{k}=-C\mathbf{p}$ for a constant $C>s_1/|\mathbf{p}|$. Then

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})-E_m(\mathbf{p})+|\mathbf{k}|=0.$$

It contradicts Lemma 6.1. Therefore ${G_m^+}'(s)<1$ holds for all $0\le s\le|\mathbf{p}|$.

Next, by using this inequality, we prove Theorem 3.9. By (21) and convexity of G_m, it holds that

$$c_m(\mathbf{p}):=\frac{G_m(|\mathbf{p}|)}{|\mathbf{p}|}\le b_m(\mathbf{p})<1.$$

We define a set of functions:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C} := \{J : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+ | J \text{ is convex}, \quad 0 \leq J(s) \leq s, \ (s \geq 0) \\ J(|\mathbf{p}|) = G_m(|\mathbf{p}|), J(2|\mathbf{p}|) = G_m(2|\mathbf{p}|)\}\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}| &= |\mathbf{k}| + G_m(\mathbf{p}) - G_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) \\ &\geq |\mathbf{k}| + G_m(\mathbf{p}) - \sup_{J \in \mathcal{C}} J(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}). \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

The maximal function in $\mathcal{C}$ is given by the following line graph:

$$J_{\max}(s) := \begin{cases} c_m(\mathbf{p})s & \text{if } \ s \leq |\mathbf{p}|, \\ b_m(\mathbf{p})(s - |\mathbf{p}|) + G_m(|\mathbf{p}|) & \text{if } \ |\mathbf{p}| \leq s \leq 2|\mathbf{p}|, \\ s - 2|\mathbf{p}| + G_m(2|\mathbf{p}|) & \text{if } \ 2|\mathbf{p}| \leq |\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}|. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}(22) \geq |\mathbf{k}| + G_m(|\mathbf{p}|) - &\begin{cases} c_m(\mathbf{p})|\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}| & \text{if } \ |\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}| \leq |\mathbf{p}|, \\ b_m(\mathbf{p})(|\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}| - |\mathbf{p}|) + G_m(|\mathbf{p}|) & \text{if } \ |\mathbf{p}| \leq |\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}| \leq 2|\mathbf{p}|, \\ |\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}| - 2|\mathbf{p}| + G_m(2|\mathbf{p}|) & \text{if } \ 2|\mathbf{p}| \leq |\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}|. \end{cases} \\ = &\begin{cases} |\mathbf{k}| + c_m(\mathbf{p})(|\mathbf{p}| - |\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}|) & \text{if } \ |\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}| \leq |\mathbf{p}|, \\ |\mathbf{k}| - b_m(\mathbf{p})(|\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}| - |\mathbf{p}|) & \text{if } \ |\mathbf{p}| \leq |\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}| \leq 2|\mathbf{p}|, \\ |\mathbf{k}| - |\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}| + (2 - b_m(\mathbf{p}))|\mathbf{p}| & \text{if } \ 2|\mathbf{p}| \leq |\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}|. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Using the triangle inequality, one can obtain the desired estimate. Finally we prove (10). Since ${G_m^+}'(0) < 1$ and G_m is convex, the constant $a_m(P)$ is strictly positive for all $P > 0$. It is easy that

$${G_m^+}'(s) \leq \frac{G_m(P)}{P} = \frac{-a_m(P) + P}{P}, \quad s \leq P.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}E_m(\mathbf{k}) - E_m(0) + |\mathbf{k}| = |\mathbf{k}| - G_m(|\mathbf{k}|) &= \int_0^{|\mathbf{k}|} (1 - {G_m^+}'(s))\mathrm{d}s \\ &\geq \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_0^{|\mathbf{k}|} \Big(1 - \frac{G_m(P)}{P}\Big)\mathrm{d}s & \text{if } \ |\mathbf{k}| \leq P. \\ \displaystyle\int_0^{P} \Big(1 - \frac{G_m(P)}{P}\Big)\mathrm{d}s + \int_P^{|\mathbf{k}|} (1 - {G_m^+}'(s))\mathrm{d}s & \text{if } \ |\mathbf{k}| > P. \end{cases} \\ &\geq \begin{cases} (a_m(P)/P)|\mathbf{k}|, & \text{if } \ |\mathbf{k}| \leq P. \\ a_m(P), & \text{if } \ |\mathbf{k}| > P. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

7 Proofs of Theorem 4.1-4.3

In the massive case $m > 0$, $H_m(\mathbf{p})$ has a normalized ground state $\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathrm{Dom}(H_f(m))$. There exists a sequence $\{\Phi_{m_j}(\mathbf{p})\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$, $m_j \to 0 (j \to \infty)$ such that $\{\Phi_{m_j}\}$ has a weak limit $\Phi_0(\mathbf{p})$. If $\Phi_0(\mathbf{p}) \neq 0$, then the massless Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{p})$ has a ground state(see [6, Lemma 4.9]).

In this section, we sometimes use the following identification

$$\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}} = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}^{(n)}, \quad \mathcal{F}^{(n)} := \otimes_s^n L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1,2\}),$$

and

$$\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}^{(n)} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1,2\}; \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}^{(n-1)}), \quad n = 1,2,3,\ldots.$$

where each vector $\Psi^{(n)} \in \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ is identified with a Hilbert space valued function $\Psi^{(n)}(\mathbf{k},\lambda;\cdot)$ $: \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1,2\} \mapsto \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}^{(n-1)}$.

For a vector $\Psi \in \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$, we define an object

$$a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Psi := (\Psi^{(1)}(\mathbf{k},\lambda), \sqrt{2}\Psi^{(2)}(\mathbf{k},\lambda;\cdot), \ldots, \sqrt{n}\Psi^{(n)}(\mathbf{k},\lambda;\cdot), \ldots) \in \mathop{\times}\limits_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}^{(n)},$$

where the symbol "×" means the direct product. In general, $a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Psi \notin \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$, but we can show that $a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Psi \in \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$ for a class of vectors $\Psi \in \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$. Let $\mathrm{w} : \mathbb{R}^3 \to [0,\infty)$ be an almost positive Borel measurable function, and we denote its multiplication operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1,2\})$ by the same symbol. For $\Psi = (\Psi^{(n)})_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathrm{d}\Gamma(\mathrm{w})^{1/2})$, the object $a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Psi$ is a $\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$-valued function: $a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Psi \in \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$, a.e. $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \lambda = 1,2$. Because, if $\Psi \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathrm{d}\Gamma(\mathrm{w})^{1/2})$, then

$$\|\mathrm{d}\Gamma(\mathrm{w})^{1/2}\Psi\|^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\lambda=1,2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} n\mathrm{w}(\mathbf{k}) \|\Psi^{(n)}(\mathbf{k},\lambda;\cdot)\|^2_{\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}^{(n-1)}} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{k} < \infty,$$

which implies $a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Psi \in \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$ for almost every $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\lambda = 1,2$. Hence, for all $\Psi \in \mathrm{Dom}(N_{\mathrm{b}}^{1/2})$, $a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Psi$ is a $\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$-valued function. We set $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{k},\lambda) := \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{k},\lambda;0)$.

Proposition 7.1. *Let* $m > 0$. *Then* $a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathrm{Dom}(H_m(\mathbf{p}))$, a.e. $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \lambda = 1,2$ *and*

$$a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{q}{\sqrt{2}}(H_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{k},\lambda)\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}), \quad \text{a.e. } (\mathbf{k},\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1,2\}. \tag{23}$$

Proof. For all $f \in \mathrm{Dom}(\omega_m)$ and $\Psi \in \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$\langle (H_m(\mathbf{p}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}))\Psi, a(f)\Phi_m(\mathbf{p})\rangle = \langle \Psi, \big\{ -a(\omega_m f) + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot a(\hat{\mathbf{k}}f) + \tfrac{q}{\sqrt{2}}\langle f, \mathbf{g}\rangle \big\} \Phi_m(\mathbf{p})\rangle.$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{\lambda=1,2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(\mathbf{k},\lambda)^* \langle (H_m(\mathbf{p}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}))\Psi, a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p})\rangle =$$

$$\sum_{\lambda=1,2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(\mathbf{k},\lambda)^* \big\langle \Psi, -\omega_m(\mathbf{k})a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}) + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{k} a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}) + q\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{k},\lambda)\Phi_m(\mathbf{p})\big\rangle.$$

Since the subspace $\mathrm{Dom}(\omega_m)$ is dense in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1,2\})$, using du-Bois Reymond's Lemma, we obtain

$$\langle (H_m(\mathbf{p}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}))\Psi, a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p})\rangle = \big\langle \Psi, (-\omega_m(\mathbf{k})a_\lambda(\mathbf{k}) + \boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{k}\, a_\lambda(\mathbf{k}) + q\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{k},\lambda))\Phi_m(\mathbf{p})\big\rangle,$$

for almost every $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \lambda = 1, 2$, and all $\Psi \in \mathcal{D}$. This means that $a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}) \in D(\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})})$ and

$$(\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})} - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}) - \boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{k})a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{q}{\sqrt{2}}\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{k},\lambda)\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}).$$

Hence (23) follows. ☐

Proof of Theorem 4.1. By Proposition 7.1 and the present assumption, we have that

$$\lim_{m\to+0} \|N_{\mathrm{b}}^{1/2}\Phi_m(\mathbf{p})\|^2 \leq \lim_{m\to+0}\sum_{\lambda=1}^{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{q^2}{2}\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{k},\lambda)\|^2}{(E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}| + m)^2}\mathrm{d}\mathbf{k}.$$

By Proposition 3.2, we have that

$$0 \leq E(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}| \leq 2|\mathbf{k}|.$$

Hence

$$\frac{q^2}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{|\rho(\mathbf{k})|^2}{|\mathbf{k}|^3}\mathrm{d}\mathbf{k} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{q^2}{(E(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}|)^2}\frac{|\rho(\mathbf{k})|^2}{|\mathbf{k}|}\mathrm{d}\mathbf{k} < \infty,$$

which imply $\rho \in \mathrm{Dom}(\omega^{-3/2})$. Thus, by using the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem with Theorem 3.9, we obtain

$$\lim_{m\to+0}\|N_{\mathrm{b}}^{1/2}\Phi_m(\mathbf{p})\|^2 < 1.$$

Each component of the massive ground state $\Phi_{m_j}(\mathbf{p})^{(n)}$ converges to $\Phi_0(\mathbf{p})^{(n)}$ weakly as $j \to \infty$, and $\lim_{j\to\infty}\|N_{\mathrm{b}}^{1/2}\Phi_{m_j}\| < 1$. Since $\mathbb{C}^4$ is a finite dimensional space, $\Phi_{m_j}(\mathbf{p})^{(0)} \to \Phi_0(\mathbf{p})^{(0)}$ strongly. It is easy to see that

$$\|\Phi_0(\mathbf{p})\|^2 \geq \|\Phi_0(\mathbf{p})^{(0)}\|^2 = \lim_{j\to\infty}\|\Phi_{m_j}(\mathbf{p})^{(0)}\|^2 = \lim_{j\to\infty}\langle\Phi_{m_j}(\mathbf{p}), P_\Omega\Phi_{m_j}(\mathbf{p})\rangle,$$

where P_Ω is the orthogonal projection on the Fock vacuum $(1, 0, 0, \ldots) \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$. Hence we have

$$\|\Phi_0(\mathbf{p})\|^2 \geq 1 - \lim_{j\to\infty}\|N_{\mathrm{b}}^{1/2}\Phi_{m_j}(\mathbf{p})\|^2 > 0.$$

This means that $\Phi_0(\mathbf{p}) \neq 0$ and $\Phi_0(\mathbf{p})$ is a ground state of $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$. ☐

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Theorem 4.2 is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 ☐

For a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$, we denote by $\mathsf{B}(\mathcal{K})$ the set of bounded operators on $\mathcal{K}$.

One can easily prove the following proposition:

Lemma 7.2. *For each direction* $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ *with* $|\mathbf{j}| = 1$, *the operator valued function* $\mathbb{R}^3 \backslash \{0\}$: $\mathbf{k} \to (\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})} - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1} \in \mathsf{B}(\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}})$ *is differentiable in the norm resolvent sense, and*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_{\mathbf{j}}(\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})} - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1} \\
&= (\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})} - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1} \left(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{j} + (1+m)\frac{\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{j}}{|\mathbf{k}|}\right) (\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})} - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\partial_{\mathbf{j}}$ *means the differential for the* $\mathbf{j}$*-direction.*

We fix the following polarization vectors in the rest of this section.

$$\mathbf{e}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{(k_2, -k_1, 0)}{\sqrt{k_1^2 + k_2^2}}, \quad \mathbf{e}^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}) := \frac{\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{k}|} \wedge \mathbf{e}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}). \tag{24}$$

For the set S (which is defined in Hypothesis (Λ)), we define $\Omega := S \backslash \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3 | k_1 = k_2 = 0\}$, $\Omega_R := S_R \cap \Omega$. By Proposition 7.2, we get the following proposition.

Lemma 7.3. *Assume the assumptions in Theorem 4.3. Then* $a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p})$ *is strongly continuously differentiable in* Ω *and*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_j a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}) \\
&= \frac{q}{\sqrt{2}}(\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})} - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1} \left(\alpha_j + (1+m)\frac{k_j}{|\mathbf{k}|}\right) \\
&\quad \times (\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})} - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{k}, \lambda)\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}) \\
&\quad + \frac{q}{\sqrt{2}}(\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})} - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot (\partial_j \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{k}, \lambda))\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}),
\end{aligned}$$

where ∂_j *is a differential operator in* $k_j, (j = 1, 2, 3)$.

We set

$$\Psi_j(\mathbf{k}, \lambda) = (\Psi_j^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}, \lambda; \cdot))_{n=0}^{\infty} := \partial_j a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p}).$$

Lemma 7.4. *Assume the assumptions in Theorem 4.3. Then*

$$\partial_j \Phi_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{p})(\mathbf{k}, \lambda; k_2, \ldots, k_n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Psi_j^{(n-1)}(\mathbf{k}, \lambda; k_2, \ldots, k_n), \quad k_\ell = (\mathbf{k}_\ell, \lambda_\ell),$$

for all $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}_\ell \in \Omega$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda, \lambda_\ell = 1, 2$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, *where* ∂_j *is the distributional derivative in* k_j.

Proof. In this proof, we omit the polarization coordinates λ, λ_ℓ and the total momentum $\mathbf{p}$. By the definition, for all $\psi(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{k}_n) \in C_0^\infty(\Omega^{n+1})$, we have

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} (\partial_j \psi)(\mathbf{k}, K)\Phi_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}, K) = \lim_{h \to 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} \psi(\mathbf{k}, K) \frac{1}{|h|}[\Psi_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{k} + h\mathbf{j}, K) - \Psi_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}, K)] \mathrm{d}\mathbf{k}\mathrm{d}K,$$

where $K = (\mathbf{k}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{k}_n)$ and $\mathbf{j}$ is the unit vector of j-th axis. Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{k} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3(n-1)}} \mathrm{d}K \psi(\mathbf{k}, K) \left\{ \frac{1}{|h|}[\Phi_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}+h\mathbf{j}, K) - \Phi_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}, K)] - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\Psi^{(n-1)}(\mathbf{k}, K)\right\}\right]\right| \\ &\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{k} \|\psi(\mathbf{k}, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3(n-1)})} \left\| \frac{\Delta_h}{|h|}\Phi_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}, \cdot) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\Psi^{(n-1)}(\mathbf{k}, \cdot)\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3(n-1)})}, \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where the operator Δ_h is defined by $\Delta_h f(\mathbf{k}) := f(\mathbf{k} + h\mathbf{j}) - f(\mathbf{k})$ for all functions f. Note that $|h|^{-1}\Delta_h \Phi_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}, \cdot)$ converges to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\Psi^{(n-1)}(\mathbf{k}, \cdot)$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega^{3(n-1)})$ by Proposition 7.3. Since the function $\mathbf{k} \to \Psi^{(n-1)}(\mathbf{k}, \cdot)$ is strongly continuous in Ω, we have

$$\frac{\Delta_h}{|h|}\Phi_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}, \cdot) = \text{s-}\int_0^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\Psi^{(n-1)}(\mathbf{k} + th\mathbf{j}, \cdot)\mathrm{d}t,$$

where s-$\int$ means the strong integral. By Proposition 7.3, $\|\Psi^{(n-1)}(\mathbf{k}, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3(n-1)})}$ is continuous in Ω, and therefore bounded in $\{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3 | \|\psi(\mathbf{k}, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3(n-1)})} \neq 0\}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\| \frac{\Delta_h}{|h|}\Phi_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}, \cdot) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\Psi^{(n-1)}(\mathbf{k}, \cdot)\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3(n-1)})} \\ &\leq \sup_{|t|\leq 1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|\Psi^{(n-1)}(\mathbf{k} + th\mathbf{j}, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3(n-1)})} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|\Psi^{(n-1)}(\mathbf{k}, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3(n-1)})} \\ &\leq \text{const.}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can apply the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, and the right hand side of (25) converges to zero as $|h| \to 0$. □

By Proposition 7.2 and direct calculations, we obtain the following lemma:

Lemma 7.5. *Suppose that the assumption of Theorem 4.3 holds. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_{(\mathbf{k})_j}\Phi_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{k}, \lambda; \cdot)\| \leq& \|\partial_j a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_m(\mathbf{p})\| \\ \leq& \frac{|q|}{\sqrt{2}}(2+m)(E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-2}\frac{|\rho(\mathbf{k})|}{|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}} \\ &+ \frac{|q|}{\sqrt{2}}(E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1}\frac{|\partial_j\rho(\mathbf{k})|}{|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}} \\ &+ \frac{|q|}{\sqrt{2}}(E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1}\frac{|\rho(\mathbf{k})|}{|\mathbf{k}|^{3/2}} \\ &+ \frac{|q|}{\sqrt{2}}(E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1}\frac{|\rho(\mathbf{k})|}{|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}}|\partial_j\mathbf{e}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k})|\end{aligned}$$

for all $\mathbf{k} \in \Omega$, $\lambda = 1, 2$, $j = 1, 2, 3$.

Our polarization vectors (24) satisfy

$$|\partial_j\mathbf{e}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k})| \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{k_1^2 + k_2^2}}, \quad \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \backslash \{\mathbf{k}' \in \mathbb{R}^3 | k_1' = k_2' = 0\}. \tag{26}$$

We set

$$\begin{aligned}
f_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) &:= (E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-2}\frac{|\rho(\mathbf{k})|}{|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}} \\
f_m^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}) &:= (E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1}\frac{|\partial_j\rho(\mathbf{k})|}{|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}} \\
f_m^{(3)}(\mathbf{k}) &:= (E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1}\frac{|\rho(\mathbf{k})|}{|\mathbf{k}|^{3/2}} \\
f_m^{(4)}(\mathbf{k}) &:= (E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + \omega_m(\mathbf{k}))^{-1}\frac{|\rho(\mathbf{k})|}{|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}}|\partial_j\mathbf{e}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k})|.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.6. *Assume the conditions in Theorem 4.3. Then*

$$\sup_{0<m\le 1}\|f_m^{(j)}\|_{L^p(S_R)} < \infty, \quad j=1,2,3,4, \quad p\in[1,2).$$

Proof. We give a proof in the case $\mathbf{p}\neq 0$. The proof of the case $\mathbf{p}=0$ is similar to the proof of the case $\mathbf{p}\neq 0$. By Theorem 3.9, we have

$$(E_m(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}|)^{-1} \le \frac{1}{1-b_m(\mathbf{p})}\max\Big\{\frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|},\frac{1}{|\mathbf{p}|}\Big\} \le C\max\Big\{\frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|},\frac{1}{|\mathbf{p}|}\Big\},$$

where

$$C := \sup_{0<m\le 1}\frac{1}{1-b_m(\mathbf{p})}$$

is a finite constant. Hence,

$$f_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \le C^2\Big\{\frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|^2}+\frac{1}{|\mathbf{p}|^2}\Big\}\frac{|\rho(\mathbf{k})|}{|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}},$$

Since S_R is a bounded region, by the assumption $|\mathbf{k}|^{-5/2}|\rho(\mathbf{k})|\in L^p(S_R)$, we obtain that

$$\sup_{0<m\le 1}\|f_m^{(1)}\|_{L^p(S_R)} < \infty.$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$\sup_{0<m\le 1}\|f_m^{(j)}\|_{L^2(S_R)} < \infty, \quad j=2,3.$$

By (26), we have

$$f_4(\mathbf{k}) \le C^2\Big\{\frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|}+\frac{1}{|\mathbf{p}|}\Big\}\frac{1}{\sqrt{k_1^2+k_2^2}}\frac{|\rho(\mathbf{k})|}{|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}}.$$

By using the polar coordinate, we have

$$\int_{S_R} f_m^{(4)}(\mathbf{k})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{k} \le 2\pi C\int_{[0,\pi)}\sin\theta\,\mathrm{d}\theta\left[\frac{1}{\sin\theta}\right]^p\int_{[0,R)}|\mathbf{k}|^{2-p}\Big(\frac{|\mathbf{k}|+|\mathbf{p}|}{|\mathbf{k}|\cdot|\mathbf{p}|}\Big)^p\frac{|\rho(\mathbf{k})|^p}{|\mathbf{k}|}\mathrm{d}|\mathbf{k}| < \infty.$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 7.7. *Suppose that the assumption of Theorem 4.3 holds. Then each component of the massive ground state is in a Sobolev space:* $\Phi_m^{(n)} \in \oplus^4 W^{1,p}((\Omega_R \times \{1,2\})^n)$ *for all* $p \in [1,2)$, $R > 0$ *and*

$$\sup_{0<m<1} \|\Phi_m^{(n)}(\mathbf{p})\|_{\oplus^4 W^{1,p}((\Omega_R\times\{1,2\})^n)} < \infty.$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of [9, page 557, **Step 2.**]. In this proof, we used Lemma 7.5 and Lemma 7.6. □

Proof of Theorem 4.3. By the assumption of Theorem 4.3 and Proposition 7.1 , there exists a sequence $\{m_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ such that the subsequence $\{\Phi_{m_j}(\mathbf{p})\}_{j=1}^\infty$ and $\{N_{\rm b}^{1/2}\Phi_{m_j}(\mathbf{p})\}_{j=1}^\infty$ have weak limits as $m_j \to 0 (j \to \infty)$. We denote by $\Phi_0(\mathbf{p})$ the weak limit of $\{\Phi_{m_j}(\mathbf{p})\}_{j=1}^\infty$. If $\Phi_0(\mathbf{p}) \neq 0$, when $\Phi_0(\mathbf{p})$ is a ground state of $H(\mathbf{p})$ (see [6]).

Any vector $\Psi \in \oplus^4\mathcal{F}^n = \mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}^n$ is a function of the particle spin coordinate $X \in \{1,2,3,4\}$, the n-photon wave number argument $(\mathbf{k}_1,\dots,\mathbf{k}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{3n}$, and the photon helicity arguments $\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n \in \{1,2\}$. For simplicity, we set

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_j^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}_1,\dots,\mathbf{k}_n) &:= \Phi_{m_j}(\mathbf{p})^{(n)}(X;\mathbf{k}_1,\lambda_1;\cdots;\mathbf{k}_n,\lambda_n),\\
\Phi_0^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}_1,\dots,\mathbf{k}_n) &:= \Phi_0(\mathbf{p})^{(n)}(X;\mathbf{k}_1,\lambda_1;\dots;\mathbf{k}_n,\lambda_n).
\end{aligned}$$

for $X \in \{1,2,3,4\}$ and $\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n \in \{1,2\}$. Note that $\Phi_j^{(n)}, \Phi_0^{(n)} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3n})$. We show that $\text{s-lim}_{j\to\infty} \Phi_j^{(n)} = \Phi_0^{(n)}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $X \in \{1,2,3,4\}$ and $\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n \in \{1,2\}$.

Since $|S_R| < \infty$ for all $R > 0$, $L^s(S_R) \subset L^2(S_R)$ for $s \geq 2$ for all $R > 0$. By this fact, for all $p \in [1,2)$, $\{\Phi_j^{(n)}\}_j$ weakly converges to $\Phi_0^{(n)}$ in the sense of $L^p(S_R^{3n})$. By Lemma 7.7, $\sup_j \|\Phi_j\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega_R^n)} < \infty$. Therefore, a subsequence of $\{\Phi_j^{(n)}\}_j$ converges to a vector $\widetilde{\Phi}_{0,R}^{(n)} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_R^n)$ in the sense of the dual Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(\Omega_R^n)^*$, i.e., for all linear functionals $f \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_R^n)^*$, $f(\Phi_j^{(n)} - \widetilde{\Phi}_{0,R}^{(n)}) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. By a general fact of the dual of $W^{1,p}$(e.g. [12]), for all $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{3n} \in L^p(\Omega_R^n)^* = L^s(\Omega_R^n)$, $(p^{-1} + s^{-1} = 1)$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega_R^n} f_0(\Phi_j^{(n)} - \widetilde{\Phi}_{0,R}^{(n)}) + \sum_{i=1}^{3n} \int_{\Omega_R^n} f_i \partial_i (\Phi_j^{(n)} - \widetilde{\Phi}_{0,R}^{(n)}) \to 0, \quad (j \to \infty).$$

Therefore we have for all $R > 0$

$$\Phi_0^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}_1,\dots,\mathbf{k}_n) = \widetilde{\Phi}_{0,R}^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}_1,\dots,\mathbf{k}_n), \quad (\mathbf{k}_1,\dots,\mathbf{k}_n) \in \Omega_R^n.$$

Hence for all $p \in [1,2)$, we have $\Phi_j^{(n)} \to \Phi_0^{(n)}$, $(j \to \infty)$ in the weak sense of $W^{1,p}(\Omega_R^n)$. Since we assume that ρ is rotation invariant, the set S_R is a spherically symmetric region in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and Ω_R is a S_R without the k_3-axis. By the assumption of Theorem 4.3, Ω_R has the cone property. By using the Rellich-Kondrashov theorem([12, Theorem 8.9]), we have

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \|\Phi_j^{(n)} - \Phi_0^{(n)}\|_{L^s(\Omega_R^n)} = 0,$$

for all $s < \frac{3np}{3n-p}$. Since $p \in [1,2)$ is arbitrary, we choose $p = 6n/(3n+2) \in [1,2)$, and we get $\lim_{j\to\infty} \|\Phi_j^{(n)} - \Phi_0^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega_R^n)} = 0$, for all $R > 0$. We set $\Phi_j := (\Phi_j^{(n)})_{n=0}^\infty, \Phi_0 := (\Phi_0^{(n)})_{n=0}^\infty \in \oplus^4 \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$. Let χ_R be the characteristic function of the ball $\{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3 | |\mathbf{k}| < R\}$. We denote by P_n the orthogonal projection to the n-photon subspace $\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{F}^n$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma(\chi_R)(\Phi_j - \Phi_0)\|^2 &= \|P_n\Gamma(\chi_R)(\Phi_j - \Phi_0)\|^2 + \|(1-P_n)\Gamma(\chi_R)(\Phi_j - \Phi_0)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|P_n\Gamma(\chi_R)(\Phi_j - \Phi_0)\|^2 + \frac{1}{n}\|N_{\mathrm{b}}^{1/2}\Gamma(\chi_R)(\Phi_j - \Phi_0)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since each component $(\Gamma(\chi_R)\Phi_j)^{(n)}$ converges to $(\Gamma(\chi_R)\Phi_0)^{(n)}$ strongly as $j \to \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \|\Gamma(\chi_R)(\Phi_j - \Phi_0)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \limsup_{j\to\infty} \|\Gamma(\chi_R) N_{\mathrm{b}}^{1/2}(\Phi_j - \Phi_0)\|^2,$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore we obtain

$$\operatorname*{s-lim}_{j\to\infty} \Gamma(\chi_R)\Phi_j = \Gamma(\chi_R)\Phi_0. \tag{27}$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 7.1 we have

$$\|H_f^{1/2}\Phi_j\|^2 = \sum_{\lambda=1,2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathbf{k}| \|a_\lambda(\mathbf{k})\Phi_j\|^2 \mathrm{d}\mathbf{k} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{q^2|\rho(\mathbf{k})|^2}{(E_{m_j}(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E_{m_j}(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}| + m_j)^2} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{k} < \infty.$$

Using the condition $\rho \in \mathrm{Dom}(\omega^{-1})$ with Theorem 3.9, we can show that

$$\limsup_{j\to\infty} \|H_f^{1/2}\Phi_j\|^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{q^2|\rho(\mathbf{k})|^2}{(E(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}) - E(\mathbf{p}) + |\mathbf{k}|)^2} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{k} < \infty.$$

Therefore for all $R > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_j - \Phi_0\|^2 &= \|\Gamma(\chi_R)(\Phi_j - \Phi_0)\|^2 + \|(1-P_0)(\Gamma(\chi_R) - 1)(\Phi_j - \Phi_0)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\Gamma(\chi_R)(\Phi_j - \Phi_0)\|^2 + \|(1-P_0)(1-\Gamma(\chi_R))H_f^{-1/2}\|^2 \cdot \|H_f^{1/2}(\Phi_j - \Phi_0)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\Gamma(\chi_R)(\Phi_j - \Phi_0)\|^2 + \frac{\text{const.}}{R} \end{aligned}$$

where “const.” means the constant independent of $R > 0$. By (27), we get that

$$\operatorname*{s-lim}_{j\to\infty} \Phi_j = \Phi_0.$$

This means the Φ_0 is a normalized ground state of $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$. □

8 Proof of Theorem 5.2

In this section we assume the assumptions in Theorem 5.2. By the arguments in Appendices A and B, it suffices to prove Theorem 5.2 in the case $\mathbf{e} = \bar{\mathbf{e}}$. Here $\bar{\mathbf{e}}$ is a special polarization vector (32). Note that $\bar{\mathbf{e}}$ depends on $\mathbf{j}$. For simplicity, we suppose that there exists a non-negative constant t such that $\mathbf{p} = t\mathbf{j}$. We choose a matrix $T \in SO(3)$ such that $T^{-1}\mathbf{p} = (0, 0, |\mathbf{p}|)$ and $T^{-1}\mathbf{j} = (0, 0, 1)$. Let U be the unitary operator which is defined in the proof of Proposition 3.4. By (14), we obtain

$$U\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}U^* = \overline{(|\mathbf{p}|\alpha_3 + M\beta + H_f(m) - \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\hat{\mathbf{k}}) - q\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \Phi_{\mathrm{S}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}))},$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = \frac{\rho(T\mathbf{k})}{|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}}(T^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{e}}^{(1)}(T\mathbf{k}), T^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{e}}^{(2)}(T\mathbf{k})) \in (L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1, 2\}))^3.$$

Since $T \in SO(3)$, we have that

$$T^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{e}}^{(1)}(T\mathbf{k}) = \frac{T^{-1}[(T\mathbf{k}) \times \mathbf{j}]}{|(T\mathbf{k}) \times \mathbf{j}|} = \frac{\mathbf{k} \times (0, 0, 1)}{|\mathbf{k} \times (0, 0, 1)|}, \quad T^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{e}}^{(2)}(T\mathbf{k}) = \frac{\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{k}|} \times (T^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{e}}^{(1)}(T\mathbf{k})).$$

It is easy to see that $\rho(TR'\mathbf{k}) = \rho(T\mathbf{k}), \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ for all $R' \in O(3)$ with $R'(0, 0, 1) = (0, 0, 1)$. Since $\mathbf{S} = (i/4)\boldsymbol{\alpha} \times \boldsymbol{\alpha}$, we have

$$U(\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{S})U^* = \frac{i}{4}\mathbf{j} \cdot [(T\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \cdot (T\boldsymbol{\alpha})] = \frac{i}{4}\mathbf{j} \cdot [T(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \times \boldsymbol{\alpha})] = \frac{i}{4}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \times \boldsymbol{\alpha})_3 = S_3.$$

Moreover, one can show that $U(\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\boldsymbol{\ell}))U^* = \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\ell_3)$. Therefore,

$$UJ_{\mathbf{j}}(\bar{\mathbf{e}})U^* = S_3 + \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\ell_3),$$

and, hence, we conclude that it is sufficient to prove the theorem in the case

$$\mathbf{p} = (0, 0, |\mathbf{p}|), \quad \mathbf{j} = (0, 0, 1). \tag{28}$$

Proof of Theorem 5.2. We assume (28) to the end of this proof. We put

$$\check{\mathbf{e}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) := \frac{(k_2, -k_1, 0)}{\sqrt{k_1^2 + k_2^2}}, \quad \check{\mathbf{e}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}) := \frac{\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{k}|} \times \check{\mathbf{e}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}).$$

For a real parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$W := \exp[i\theta J_{\mathbf{j}}(\check{\mathbf{e}})], \quad \Theta := \begin{bmatrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta & 0 \\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is elementary to show that

$$W\boldsymbol{\alpha}W^* = \Theta\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \quad W\beta W^* = \beta, \tag{29}$$

$$W\mathrm{d}\Gamma(\hat{\mathbf{k}})W^* = \Theta\mathrm{d}\Gamma(\hat{\mathbf{k}}), \quad WH_f(m)W^* = H_f(m), \tag{30}$$

$$W\mathbf{A}W^* = \Theta\mathbf{A}. \tag{31}$$

Here, to show (31) we use the concrete form of $\check{\mathbf{e}}$:

$$\check{\mathbf{e}}^{(\lambda)}(\Theta\mathbf{k}) = \Theta\check{\mathbf{e}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k}), \quad \lambda = 1, 2.$$

Since $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ is arbitrary, (29),(30) and (31) implies that $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ commutes with $J_{\mathbf{j}}(\check{\mathbf{e}})$ strongly. Thus, by a general fact for strongly commuting self-adjoint operators, we conclude that $\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}$ is decomposable as

$$\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})} \cong \bigoplus_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_{1/2}} H_m(\mathbf{p} : z),$$

in the sense of (13). We define new unitary operators ν, τ, Υ by

$$(\nu f)(\mathbf{k}, \lambda) := \begin{cases} -f(k_1, -k_2, k_3, 1) & \text{if } \lambda = 1, \\ f(k_1, -k_2, k_3, 2) & \text{if } \lambda = 2, \quad f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1, 2\}). \end{cases}$$

$$\tau := \alpha_1\alpha_2\beta, \quad \Upsilon := \tau \cdot \Gamma(\nu).$$

It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu\ell_3\nu^* = -\ell_3, \quad \tau S_3\tau^* = -S_3, \\ &\nu k_1\nu^* = k_1, \quad \nu k_2\nu^* = -k_2, \quad \nu k_3\nu^* = k_3, \\ &\tau\alpha_1\tau^* = \alpha_1, \quad \tau\alpha_2\tau^* = -\alpha_2, \quad \tau\alpha_3\tau^* = \alpha_3, \quad \tau\beta\tau^* = \beta, \\ \nu\check{\mathbf{e}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})\nu^{-1} = &\frac{(k_2, -(-k_1), 0)}{\sqrt{k_1^2 + k_2^2}}, \quad \nu\check{\mathbf{e}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{k})\nu^{-1} = \frac{(k_1k_3, -k_2k_3, -k_1^2 - k_2^2)}{|\mathbf{k}|\sqrt{k_1^2 + k_2^2}} \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\Upsilon\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}\Upsilon^* = \overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}, \quad \Upsilon J_{\mathbf{j}}\Upsilon^* = -J_{\mathbf{j}}$$

Let $E(z), z \in \mathbb{Z}_{1/2}$ be the orthogonal projection on $\ker(J_{\mathbf{j}} - z)$. Note that $\mathrm{Ran}(E(z)) = \mathcal{F}(z)$. $E(-z)\Upsilon E(z)$ is a unitary operator from $\mathrm{Ran}(E(z))$ to $\mathrm{Ran}(E(-z))$ and

$$\begin{aligned} E(-z)\Upsilon E(z)H_m(\mathbf{p} : z)E(z)\Upsilon^* E(-z) &= E(-z)\Upsilon E(z)\Upsilon^*\overline{H_m(\mathbf{p})}\Upsilon E(z)\Upsilon^* E(-z) \\ &= H_m(\mathbf{p} : -z). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $H_m(\mathbf{p} : z)$ is unitarily equivalent to $H_m(\mathbf{p} : -z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}_{1/2}$. □

9 Appendix A: A Remark on the Polarization Vectors

In this appendix, we show that the quantum electrodynamics does not depend on the choice of polarization vectors, i.e., the Hamiltonians defined by different polarization vectors are unitarily equivalent each other. We show the equivalence only for the Hamiltonians H and $H(\mathbf{p})$, but one can apply our proof to the Pauli-Fierz model and various QED models. In the proof, we do not use the form of the cutoff function ρ and dispersion ω, and use only the facts that ρ and ω are independent of the helicity argument λ.

We assume that the polarization vectors $\mathbf{e}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$, $\mathbf{e}^{(2)}(\mathbf{k})$ and $\mathbf{k}$ are a right-handed system;

$$\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{e}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})=0,\quad \|\mathbf{e}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}=1,\quad \mathbf{e}^{(2)}(\mathbf{k})=\frac{\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{k}|}\wedge\mathbf{e}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}),\quad \mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{R}^3.$$

Next, we take any polarization vectors $\mathbf{e}'^{(1)}$, $\mathbf{e}'^{(2)}$:

$$\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{e}'^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k})=0,\quad \mathbf{e}'^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k})\cdot\mathbf{e}'^{(\mu)}(\mathbf{k})=\delta_{\lambda,\mu},\quad \mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{R}^3,\ \lambda,\mu\in\{1,2\}.$$

Let H' and $H'(\mathbf{p})$ be the Hamiltonians H and $H(\mathbf{p})$ with $\mathbf{e}^{(\lambda)}$ replaced $\mathbf{e}'^{(\lambda)}$, $\lambda=1,2$, respectively.

The essential self-adjointness of Hamiltonians H and $H(\mathbf{p})$ does not depend on a choice of a polarization vectors, and $\bar{H}$ and $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$ are unitarily equivalent to $\bar{H}'$ and $\overline{H'(\mathbf{p})}$, respectively:

Theorem 9.1. *Assume that H is essentially self-adjoint. Then H' is essentially self-adjoint and $\bar{H}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\bar{H}'$ by a unitary operator $U(\mathbf{e}\leftarrow\mathbf{e}')$:*

$$U(\mathbf{e}\leftarrow\mathbf{e}')\bar{H}'U(\mathbf{e}\leftarrow\mathbf{e}')^*=\bar{H}.$$

Theorem 9.2. *Assume that $H(\mathbf{p})$ is essentially self-adjoint. Then $H'(\mathbf{p})$ is essentially self-adjoint and $\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\overline{H'(\mathbf{p})}$:*

$$U(\mathbf{e}\leftarrow\mathbf{e}')\overline{H'(\mathbf{p})}U(\mathbf{e}\leftarrow\mathbf{e}')^*=\overline{H(\mathbf{p})}.$$

Remark. The unitary operators $U(\mathbf{e}\leftarrow\mathbf{e}')$ satisfy the chain-rule:

$$\begin{aligned}U(\mathbf{e}\leftarrow\mathbf{e}'')U(\mathbf{e}''\leftarrow\mathbf{e}')&=U(\mathbf{e}\leftarrow\mathbf{e}'),\\ U(\mathbf{e}\leftarrow\mathbf{e}')^*&=U(\mathbf{e}'\leftarrow\mathbf{e}).\end{aligned}$$

Proofs of Theorems 9.1 and 9.2. By the definition of polarization vectors, for each $\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{R}^3$ it holds that $\mathbf{e}'^{(2)}(\mathbf{k})=\frac{\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{k}|}\wedge\mathbf{e}'^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$ or $\mathbf{e}'^{(2)}(\mathbf{k})=-\frac{\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{k}|}\wedge\mathbf{e}'^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$. Let $O\subset\mathbb{R}^3$ be a set such that $\mathbf{e}'^{(2)}(\mathbf{k})=-\frac{\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{k}|}\wedge\mathbf{e}'^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$, $\mathbf{k}\in O$ holds. We define a polarization vectors $\mathbf{e}''^{(\lambda)}$, $\lambda=1,2$,

$$\mathbf{e}''^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}):=\mathbf{e}'^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}),\quad \mathbf{e}''^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}):=\begin{cases}\mathbf{e}'^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}), & \mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{R}^3\backslash O,\\ -\mathbf{e}'^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}), & \mathbf{k}\in O.\end{cases}$$

We define an operator H'' which is H with $\mathbf{e}^{(\lambda)}$ replacing $\mathbf{e}''^{(\lambda)}$, $\lambda=1,2$. Let

$$\mathbf{g}'(\mathbf{k},\lambda;\mathbf{x}):=\frac{\rho(\mathbf{k})}{|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}}\mathbf{e}'^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k})e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}},\quad \mathbf{g}''(\mathbf{k},\lambda;\mathbf{x}):=\frac{\rho(\mathbf{k})}{|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}}\mathbf{e}''^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k})e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}},$$

and we set

$$\mathbf{A}'(\hat{\mathbf{x}}):=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}^{\oplus}\overline{[a(\mathbf{g}'(\cdot,\mathbf{x}))+a(\mathbf{g}'(\cdot,\mathbf{x}))^*]}\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x},\quad \mathbf{A}''(\hat{\mathbf{x}}):=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}^{\oplus}\overline{[a(\mathbf{g}''(\cdot,\mathbf{x}))+a(\mathbf{g}''(\cdot,\mathbf{x}))^*]}\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x},$$

self-adjoint operators on $\mathcal{F}$. Since $\mathbf{e}''^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$, $\mathbf{e}''^{(2)}(\mathbf{k})$, $\mathbf{k}$ are a right-handed system: $\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{e}''^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = 0$, $\mathbf{e}''^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{k}|} \wedge \mathbf{e}''^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$, for all $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists $\theta(\mathbf{k}) \in [0, 2\pi)$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \\ \mathbf{e}^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\theta(\mathbf{k}) & -\sin\theta(\mathbf{k}) \\ \sin\theta(\mathbf{k}) & \cos\theta(\mathbf{k}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}''^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \\ \mathbf{e}''^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

We define a unitary operator u_1 on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1, 2\})$ by

$$\begin{bmatrix} (u_1 f)(\mathbf{k}, 1) \\ (u_1 f)(\mathbf{k}, 2) \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \cos\theta(\mathbf{k}) & -\sin\theta(\mathbf{k}) \\ \sin\theta(\mathbf{k}) & \cos\theta(\mathbf{k}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f(\mathbf{k}, 1) \\ f(\mathbf{k}, 2) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

The operator $U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}'') := \Gamma(u_1)$ is a unitary operator on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$. It is clear that

$$U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}'')\mathrm{d}\Gamma(\omega)U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}'')^* = \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\omega).$$

By the equality $u_1\mathbf{g}''(\cdot, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{g}(\cdot, \mathbf{x})$, we have $U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}'')\mathbf{A}''(\hat{\mathbf{x}})U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}'')^* = \mathbf{A}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$. Therefore we get

$$U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}'')\overline{H''}U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}'')^* = \overline{U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}'')H''U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}'')^*} = \overline{H}.$$

This means that the operator H'' is essentially self-adjoint and $\overline{H''}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\bar{H}$. Next we show that $\overline{H''}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\overline{H'}$. Let u_2 be a unitary operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1, 2\})$ such that

$$(u_2 f)(\mathbf{k}, \lambda) := \begin{cases} -f(\mathbf{k}, 2), & \mathbf{k} \in S, \\ f(\mathbf{k}, \lambda), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that $u_1 g'_j(\cdot, \mathbf{x}) = g''_j(\cdot, \mathbf{x})$, $j = 1, 2, 3$. Then $U(\mathbf{e}'' \leftarrow \mathbf{e}') := \Gamma(u_2)$ is a unitary transformation on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{rad}}$, and

$$U(\mathbf{e}'' \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')\mathrm{d}\Gamma(\omega)U(\mathbf{e}'' \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')^* = \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\omega).$$

By the definition of u_2, the equality $U(\mathbf{e}'' \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')\mathbf{A}'(\hat{\mathbf{x}})U(\mathbf{e}'' \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')^* = \mathbf{A}''(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ holds. Hence we have

$$U(\mathbf{e}'' \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')\overline{H'}U(\mathbf{e}'' \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')^* = \overline{U(\mathbf{e}'' \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')H'U(\mathbf{e}'' \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')^*} = \overline{H''},$$

which implies that H' is essentially self-adjoint and $\overline{H'}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\overline{H''}$. We set

$$U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}') := U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}'')U(\mathbf{e}'' \leftarrow \mathbf{e}').$$

Then $U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')\overline{H'}U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')^* = \bar{H}$. Therefore Theorem 9.1 is proved. The proof of Theorem 9.2 is similar to the proof of Theorem 9.1. □

10 Appendix B: A Remark on the Angular Momentum

As shown in Appendix A, the spectral properties of QED models do not depend on the choice of the polarization vectors. Hence, in the definition of the QED model, usually we do not specify the choice of the polarization vectors. However, the angular momentum of the electromagnetic field depends on a choice of the polarization vectors, because the angular momentum does not commute with $U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')$. Therefore, when one discusses the angular momentum, one has to specify the choice of polarization vectors in the definition of the model. Let $(H, \mathbf{e})$ be a pair of a Hamiltonian and a polarization vectors. The QED system is specified by this pair $(H, \mathbf{e})$.

For each unit vector $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, we define a special polarization vectors $\bar{\mathbf{e}} = (\bar{\mathbf{e}}^{(1)}, \bar{\mathbf{e}}^{(2)})$ by

$$\bar{\mathbf{e}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) := \frac{\mathbf{k} \wedge \mathbf{j}}{|\mathbf{k} \wedge \mathbf{j}|}, \quad \bar{\mathbf{e}}(2)(\mathbf{k}) := \frac{\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{k}|} \wedge \bar{\mathbf{e}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}). \tag{32}$$

For a Dirac-Maxwell system $(H, \bar{\mathbf{e}})$, the angular momentum of $\mathbf{j}$-direction is defined by

$$L_{\mathbf{j}}(\bar{\mathbf{e}}) := \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\overline{\mathbf{j} \cdot \boldsymbol{\ell}}),$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\ell} := (\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3) := i(\nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \times \mathbf{k}),$$

is a set of self-adjoint operators acting on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{1, 2\})$.

Let $\mathbf{e} = (\mathbf{e}^{(1)}, \mathbf{e}^{(2)})$ be any polarization vectors. The angular momentum of $\mathbf{j}$-direction in the Dirac-Maxwell system $(H, \mathbf{e})$ is defined by

$$L_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e}) := U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \bar{\mathbf{e}}) L_{\mathbf{j}}(\bar{\mathbf{e}}) U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \bar{\mathbf{e}})^*,$$

where $U(\bar{\mathbf{e}} \leftarrow \mathbf{e})$ be a unitary operator which is defined in Appendix A. By the chain-rule of $U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')$, the angular momentums transformed as follows:

$$L_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e}) = U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}') L_{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{e}') U(\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}')^*,$$

where $\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}'$ are arbitrary polarization vectors.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank A. Arai for his advice, discussions and encouragement. I also grateful to F. Hiroshima for his advice.

References

[1] A. Arai, Fundamental Properties of the Hamiltonian of a Dirac Particle Coupled to the Quantized Radiation Field, *Hokkaido Univ. Preprint Series in Math*, No. 447, 1999.

[2] A. Arai, A particle-field Hamiltonian in relativistic quantum electrodynamics, *J. Math. Phys.* **41** (2000), 4271-4283.

[3] A. Arai, Fock Spaces and Quantum Fields, Nippon-Hyouronsha, Tokyo, 2000 (in Japanese).

[4] A. Arai, Non-relativistic limit of a Dirac-Maxwell operator in relativistic quantum electrodynamics, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **15** (2003), 235-270.

[5] A. Arai, Non-relativistic Limit of a Dirac Polaron in Relativistic Quantum Electrodynamics, `mp_arc` 06-35, (to be published in *Lett. Math. Phys.*).

[6] A. Arai and M. Hirokawa, On the existence and uniqueness of ground states of a generalized spin-boson model, *J. Funct. Anal.* 151 (1997) 455-503.

[7] T. Chen, Operator-theoretic infrared renormalization and construction of dressed 1-particle states in non-relativistic QED, `mp_arc 01-310`.

[8] J. Fröhlich, Existence of dressed one electron states in a class of persistent models, *Fortschritte der Physik.* 22 (1974) 159-198.

[9] M. Griesemer, E. Lieb and M. Loss, Ground states in non-relativistic quantum electrodynamics, *Invent. math.* **145** (2001), 557-595.

[10] F. Hiroshima, Multiplicity of ground states in quantum field models: applications of asymptotic fields, *J. Funct. Anal.* **224** (2005), 431-470.

[11] F. Hiroshima and H. Spohn, Ground state degeneracy of the Pauli-Fierz Hamiltonian with spin, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **5** (2001), 1091-1104.

[12] E.H. Lieb and M. Loss, Analysis, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, 1997

[13] M. Loss, T. Miyao, H. Spohn, Lowest energy states in nonrelativistic QED: atoms and ions in motion, `mp_arc 06-136`.

[14] I. Sasaki, Ground state energy of polaron in the relativistic quantum electrodynamics, *J. Math. Phys.* **46**, 1 (2005).

[15] I. Sasaki, Ground state of the Polaron in the Relativistic Quantum Electrodynamics, in "Proceedings of the RIMS Symposium" (2006) (to be published).

[16] H. Spohn, Dynamics of Charged Particles and Their Radiation Field. *Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge, (2004).

[17] M. Reed and B. Simon, Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics Vol.I, Academic Press, New York, 1972

[18] M. Reed and B. Simon, Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics Vol. II, Academic Press, New York, 1975.

[19] B. Thaller, The Dirac Equation, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1992.